

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/071,314	Applicant(s) HELBER ET AL.	
	Examiner Venkataraman Balasubramanian	Art Unit 1624	

All Participants:

(1) Venkataraman Balasubramanian.

(2) Sarah Meeks Roberts.

Date of Interview: 23 February 2004

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
1-13

Claims discussed:
1-13

Prior art documents discussed:
Davis et al.

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:
Cancellation of non elected subject matter and inadvertent omission of proviso of D definition in claim 8 and therefore applicability of Davis et al. were discussed. Applicants authorized to limit X and X1 to sulfone and Y and Y1 to carbonyl cancel claim 3 and add the proviso that D is not a hemicyanine moiety in claim 8. Such will be done by examiner's amendment.